Meeting Minutes
October 21, 2015

Members Present

Commissioner Teresa Lubbers, Mr. Scott Feeny, Mr. Steve Elliott, Mr. Jeff Hudnall, Mr. Josh Towns (present until 11:08 AM), and Mr. Andrew VanZee

Members Absent

Jeff Ton (Chair)

Staff Present

Mr. Jerry Minth, Ms. San Saravanan, Mr. Darton Palmer, Ms. Carol Torres

I.   Call to Order

Mr. Hudnall, sitting in for the Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:01 AM. Mr. Hudnall called roll and a quorum was established.

II.   Chair's Welcome and Introductions of the Committee

Mr. Hudnall welcomed the members to the meeting and announced that Chair Jeff Ton was unable to attend today's meeting due to a prior commitment. Minutes from the July 22, 2015, meeting were presented for approval. Ms. Lubbers motioned for approval of minutes. Mr. VanZee seconded. Motion passed.

III.   Opportunities for Public Comment

There were no sign-ups for public comment. Mr. Hudnall stated there would be an opportunity for comments at the end of the meeting, time permitting.

IV.   INK Research Agenda

Mr. Hudnall presented the official version of the Research Agenda to the committee and reminded members that the agenda is a living document and will change in the future. Mr. Hudnall pointed out that question number 12 had been detailed out during the last RAG meeting. For now, the INK development team will focus on the research questions at a higher level. Going forward, questions will be detailed in a manner similar to question 12 as they are answered.

Mr. Hudnall stated that the goal for the RAG team in the coming months will be to help define policies and procedures for INK data use. The TAG team will work on defining data elements and their business rules. Each analyst on the INK team has been assigned one agency, except for San, who has been assigned to both DWD and CHE. Mr. Elliott commented that he likes the fact that the Research Agenda is a living document but asked how INK will handle pulling in data

that's not currently identified by the research questions, adding that we want to avoid having to go back to the agencies to pull in additional data multiple times per year. Mr. Hudnall advised that we are looking at pulling in data outside of the 23 questions – these questions provide the framework but additional data elements are being pulled in. Mr. Hudnall added that in talking with other states, we know additional questions will come up but we have to start by building a foundation, which will be flexible to allow for adding data in the future.

Mr. Towns agreed that TAG should focus on data elements but wants to make sure the group does not lose sight of the technology behind INK; they should also focus on defining role-based access, data visualization, etc. Mr. Hudnall agreed and stated that he will be focused on these items as part of building the policies and procedures, which will include input from both the RAG and TAG team members.

Mr. VanZee asked how information will be sourced in the future, who will determine what data elements are used and how will new data be added going forward. Mr. Hudnall stated that the technical team is working with each agency to determine those answers. Mr. Feeny asked that the team ensure that the INK data dictionary is transparent and clear on defining data elements, including how and how often data sets are refreshed. Mr. Hudnall stated that the INK team will capture these items when building the INK data dictionary.

The group discussed data access at length. Mr. Towns concerns about not having technology in place that would allow for public access of data. Other members echoed concerns about how data access will work both internally and externally. Mr. Hudnall stated that these concerns will be addressed as part of defining policies and procedures adding that data will be used at different levels by various users (e.g. employers, researchers, career centers, etc.), and assured the committee that no decisions regarding data access and use would be made without approval by the committee. Dr. Stacy Townsley asked, and Ms. Lubbers agreed, that the group remember INK will not be building reports but data sets.

Mr. Feeny asked for examples from other states of how data sets are shared. Mr. Hudnall stated that each state is different. Some provide data reports in a specific format; others have tools where users can query data directly. Mr. Hudnall suggested the group start by asking each agency what they would like and then have the INK team research solutions. Mr. Elliott emphasized the importance of defining all of the rules around providing data. Mr. VanZee added that we have technology today that would allow users to view data at both the internal and external levels. Mr. Hudnall stated that the committee will help to define how users access data by the conclusion of phase 2.

Mr. Elliott asked the committee to consider who the right people are to provide input around data access. Ms. Lubbers added that the group also needs to consider limitations or restrictions on data use at state and federal levels. Mr. Towns commented that there would also be limitations on data use for agencies. Mr. Towns added that the group should determine what a self-service portal would look like; he stated that DOE wants the public to be able to query data without violating privacy rules (i.e. DOE needs flexible but secure public access). Mr. Hudnall advised that a self-service portal is not in scope for phase 2.

Mr. Elliott suggested the committee members reach out to stakeholders to understand INK's vision. Mr. Hudnall stated that he has done some of that already, having gone out and spoken

to a few universities to get input and they have all been extremely positive. Ms. Lubbers asked Mr. Hudnall to provide a 2-sentence statement explaining INK's value proposition. Mr. Hudnall responded that INK data will be used to make informed decisions. Ms. Lubbers suggested that INK's value is really based on integrated data. Mr. Elliott asked that the committee determine a succinct description of INK's value, an "elevator speech". Mr. Hudnall will work on putting together a value proposition and share with the group. Mr. Feeny agreed and added that value may be different depending on the audience. Ms. Lubbers stated that the value proposition should be used to measure how well INK is doing.

Ms. Lubbers asked for clarification on work that MPH is doing. Mr. Hudnall stated that MPH is housing INK through the SAP Hana platform. Mr. VanZee asked if there was an MOU in place to spell that out. Mr. Hudnall stated he will check but does not believe the MOU specifies MPH's exact role. Mr. Elliott mentioned that MPH put together a diagram to clarify their role. Mr. Hudnall added that the INK website contains an FAQ section that may provide some clarity as well.

V.   **Project Phase 2 Update**
        Mr. Hudnall shared the Project Charter which outlines the timeline for INK with milestones listed on page 7. Ms. Lubbers pointed out that the business case section of the Project Charter may be a good place to start for defining value.

        Mr. Feeny asked when INK will be ready to create reports. Mr. Hudnall stated that while the INK team is working on system development by June 30, 2016, he is working on creating procedures so that by the time the system is developed, output can be produced immediately.

        Mr. Feeny stated that there needs to be a way for private institution data to be suppressed or completely pulled out of INK. Mr. VanZee stated that there will be controls in place in that agencies and stakeholders will be able to review results before being published. Mr. Feeny asked if INK had the ability to pull data in and out adding that private institutions would not provide data otherwise. Mr. Elliott commented that restrictions on data reduce its valuable. Mr. Towns added that a report can expire for a number of reasons and there has to be an automated process for ensuring data is current. He asked if rules could be established in the metadata to flag data that may need to be pulled because it is old or cannot be used for some reason. Ms. Lubbers added that she does not believe data will need to be pulled often, that it will be the exception. Mr. Feeny asked what the process would be if data needed to be excluded from the data set that INK provides. Ms. Torres stated that it would be a manual process to suppress or remove data from INK. Mr. VanZee asked if private institution data will be provided using an opt-in or opt-out model. Mr. Feeny responded that it would be opt-out.

        Mr. Towns commented that a determination should be made for handling results when data has been pulled out as that could skew the numbers. Mr. Feeny reiterated the importance of ensuring that data can be stripped out of INK completely if necessary. Mr. Hudnall stated that MPH is working on the technology that will be used to flag data so it can be pulled. Mr. Feeny stated that there are two cases that need to be accounted for: 1.) a private institution can opt out of a data set, and 2.) a private institution can opt out of INK completely. Mr. Hudnall confirmed that both options are available for INK.

        Mr. Towns left the meeting at 11:08.

VI. **Staff Updates**

(a) <u>New Staff</u>

Mr. Hudnall advised that three analysts have joined the INK development team:

Carol Torres (DOE analyst)

San Saravanan (CHE and DWD analyst)

Darton Palmer (FSSA analyst)

Mr. VanZee asked who would be working on matching the data. Mr. Hudnall advised that this work will be done by MPH (Tony, Sri and Kiran) with INK analysts acting as intermediaries between MPH and the agencies. Mr. Elliott stated that DWD has agreed to fund INK when the grant runs out but stated that some of that funding has been accelerated to ensure the timeline is met. Mr. Hudnall agreed and added that resources should not be the reason for work not moving forward.

(b) <u>Move to DWD</u>

Mr. Hudnall advised that the INK team has moved to DWD. He will share updated contact information for the INK team with the committee.

(c) <u>Work on Policies and Procedures</u>

Mr. Hudnall will be working on creating policies/procedures for INK data use.

VII. **Upcoming Meetings**

Mr. Hudnall announced the 2016 meeting schedule:

Wednesday, January 27, 2016

Wednesday, April 27, 2106

Wednesday, July 27, 2016

Wednesday, October 26, 2016

No objections were noted by the committee members.

VIII. **Adjourn**

Mr. VanZee made a motion to adjourn; Mr. Elliott seconded. The meeting adjourned at 11:22 PM.

Before committee members left, Mr. Hudnall advised the group that Mr. Galvin is no longer with DOE and therefore no longer on the Governance Committee; Mr. Towns will be taking his place.